MADURAI COLLECORATE
RECORDS

VOL NO 9029

Vol. No. 9029

R

File of Letters sent to
the Board of Revenue
1854

1854 [illegible]

G. 8212
4. 80,013

pages 1-141

502—12-3-54.

Block 7

Rack No.

Shelf No.

Serial No. 9029

General No. 30159

1854 2 [illegible]

List of Retainable papers for 18 54

Sent Letters. Board of Revenue Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	To whom sent.	Substance.
12/1/54	3	Secy Board of Rev No. [illegible]	Transmitting translation of a petition made by the Govt Vakeel in the Civil Court of Madura for the purpose of procuring the Collr to be made a supplemental defendant in the suit brought by Swamy [illegible] for the Zemindary of Ramnad
[illegible]	[illegible]	Do No. [illegible]	Stating that the cawny of 5760 Sq. feet is the cawny used in [illegible] Dt of the Madura Dt
[illegible]	8	Do	Transmitting copies of Hindoo's memoranda re Standard of weights adopted at the Survey in Madura Dt
		Do	Laying before the Board of Revenue proceedings [illegible] Zemindary and directing that Veera Ramnad Ammal may be put in possession of it
30		Do	Availing himself of the permission to bring under consideration the subject of applying to other products coming under the designation of [illegible] or [illegible], the rule requiring that the assessment in sequence shall not exceed the fixed rates of paddy

[illegible] in the file

List of Retainable papers for 1854.

Sent Letters. Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	To whom sent.	Substance.
9/3/54	37	Secy Board of Rev	Forwarding copy of the decision of the Collr with reference to the endorsement of the Board on a petition No 111/1854
11/3	40	Do	Requesting to be informed as whether Cowle according to Hookoomnamah may be allowed for lands planted with Topes of waste for more than 5 and less than 10 years
13/3	42 (not found in the file)	Do	Forwarding a Statement showing the rates of tax levied on various descriptions of trees
15/3	43	Do	Returning petition No 191/1853 concurring in the opinion of the Sub Collr that there are no peculiar circumstances in the case of the petitioner to grant him the privilege of reduction withheld from other owners of Topes
20/3	46	Do	Transmitting the Statement relative to granting money on Land Revenue which appear to come within the classes enumerated in Regn. VI of 1831
22/3	49	Do	Transmitting a table containing the information re weights and measures observed in this Dt

List of Retainable papers for 1854

Sent Letters. | Madura Collector's Office.

3

Date.	Number.	To whom sent.	Substance.
[illegible]/3/54	57.	Secy Board of Revenue	Forwarding a report from the Sub Collr on the assessment of the Pulney Hills
5/3	54	Do	Transmitting a statement exhibiting the extent of Inams (exclusive of Service Inams) in this Dist below 2 cawnies and also the total Inam Extent.
26/4	74 (not found in the file)	Do	Proposing a better system of License for the Salt monopoly as it would be attended with more risk than advantage
28/4	75 (not found in the file)	Do	Submitting answers to the queries re the manufacture of Salt in various places the average annual produce of the last 5 years &c
28/4.	76	Do	Submitting for orders copy of a letter from the Sub Collr recommending that a party who at an expense of above Rs [illegible] has constructed a tank and thereby collected rainwater which would otherwise have run to waste should be exempt from any additional taxation [illegible] wells in general
Do	77 (not found in the file)	Do	Submitting to the consideration of the Board whether reasons do not exist for an application to Govt to remove the prohibition imposed by their orders against the extension of [illegible] & similar wells or the exemption from increased taxation to new wells in general.

Sent Letters. List of Retainable papers for 1854. Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	To whom sent.	Substance.
31/5/54	88 (not found in the file)	Secy Bd of Rev	Requesting whether lands culti-vated with plantains and Turmeric as a first crop, to be excused fusly jastee ~~as~~ on a 2nd crop in the same manner as lands bearing Chillies &c with which they are assimilated in respect to taxation
2/6	90 (not found in the file)	Do	Transmitting copies of letters from the Sub Collr supporting his recommendation that Tiroomalapooche Naik the eldest son of the late Poligar of Kiaroongulapoody & Ramaspoody Talug be recog-nized as Poligar in room of his father.
Do	91.	Do	Enquiring whether the Board intend the ryot to have the option of raising a 2nd crop of dry grain without payment of fysal jastee an option of which it may be supposed he will not unfrequently take advantage of.
Do	92 (not found in the file)	Do	Bringing to notice that there remains one more practice in which the assessment is levied with reference to produce & not to the nature of the soil

List of Retainable papers for 1857.

Sent Letters. Madura Collector's Office.

Date	Number.	To whom sent.	Substance.
1/7/54	111.	Secy Board of Rev	Stating that the presenters of petitions Nos 675, 867, 1205 / 1853 is the Son of Rengasamy Thevar, the Son by affection, and alleged adopted Son of Sivagamy Nachear daughter of the deposed Zemindar of Ramnad, on whose death, the villages of Chettanendal &c enjoyed by her, were assumed by Govt on the ground that she had no legal heirs.
8/7.	112 (not found in the file)	+	Enquiring whether it is no longer necessary for new wells to be registered by village Curnams
17/7	115	Do. + Not in the file	Forwarding a decree in favor of Mutally by the Civil Court of Madura in AS No 89 of 1857 relative to the office of Superintendent of the Ramnad Chuttram at Madura
19/7	117	Do	Stating that the assertion of the petitioner in petition No 121 / 1853 having been duly enquired into were found to be quite false

2

1854 4

List of Retainable papers for 1854

Sent Letters. Board of Revenue Madura Collector's Office.

5

Date.	Number.	To whom sent.	Substance.
9/6/54.	95	Secy Board of Rev	Enquiring whether the Board have laid down any rules in regard to the course to be pursued in cases where Poonjah Inams have been converted to Nunjah by means of water from Govt Reservoirs.
29/6.	105.	Do.	Reporting the death of Koomarasamy Jotheel Naicker Zemindar of Jotheel Naickanoor & recommending that his minor son Moothoosamy Jotheel Naik may be recognized as Poligar and the estate left during the minority in charge of his mother and uncle according to their request
4/7.	109.	Do	Reporting on Board petition No 18/1854 and stating that the Inam in question was originally granted to Gholam ally Shah Fakeer or Durvish during the rule of the Nabobs and is entered in the name of that person in the Hoozur accounts for Fusly 1212 in Fusly 1229 the name was changed in the village accounts to Yacoob Khan the father of Mahomed Yacoob against whom petitioner complains and in this name it continued till Fusly 1262 when it was changed to Mahomed Yacoob

List of Retainable papers for 1854.

Sent Letters. **Madura Collector's Office.**

Date.	Number.	To whom sent.	Substance.
9/7/54	124 (not found in the file)	Secy Board of Rev	Expressing opinion that making the permission to dig wells without extra Cess will not seriously affect the Public Revenue
1/8	129	Do & with extra [illegible]	Transmitting translation of a plaint preferred by one Sirroosamy [illegible] in the Sub Court & requesting to be informed whether he should apply to be made a Supplemental [illegible] defendant the land having been purchased by Defots from Mr. Blackburne
21/8	134	[illegible]	Referring for the [illegible] the Board asking whether Curnams in unsettled Palliems are to be dealt with under Regn XXIX of 1802 or Regns IX of 18[illegible] and VI of 1831 [illegible]
16/9	155	Do	Reporting on Board [illegible] 18/1854 that the petitioner and his adversary enjoy each a Jamiah or ready money allowance of [illegible] fanam per diem as well as [illegible] Inams of 2 [illegible] Nunjah in the village of Palanjanatham which is the subject of the [illegible] petition

List of Retainable papers for 1854

Sent Letters. Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	To whom sent.	Substance.
18/9/54	176	Secy Board of Rev	Observing that owing to a clerical error in the 1st para of the letter of 4th July last by which the word yeomiah which means daily allowance in money is used at the commencement instead of Inam (grant of land) the meaning of the letter is rendered very obscure & therefore requesting that that letter may be cancelled.
29/9	180	Do.	Expressing opinion of the policy of remitting the tax to all the ryots in the assumed villages of Sittanendal &c in Ramnad Zemindary
27/10	184 (not found in the file)	Do	Reporting the death of Rama Lukka Ramachandrappa Naik, Poligar of Yermoorkula-pooram in the Zemindary of which was in receipt of a Mahalkharu of 10 per cent on the collections of that Zemindary under the Sanction of Govt.
31/10	188	Do	Reporting on Swamy Bhogam on Sittanendal &c villages in Ramnad Zemindary

3 — 8

9

List of Retainable papers for 1854

Sent Letters. Board of Revenue **Madura Collector's Office.**

Date.	Number.	To whom sent.	Substance.
1/11/54	189	Secy Board of Rev.	Reporting on the measurements of length and breadth &c in Sivagangah &c places in Madura Dt.
2/11	190	DO	Submitting a supplemental list of Kavalgars, Talliaries and Totties with their emoluments
22/11	203 (not found in the file)	DO	Stating that the 2 Inams mentioned in the report as existing in the Ramghery Zemindary for the [illegible] festival are situated in the [illegible] Waroongapoody Zemindary and are so entered in the Ryot [illegible] accounts of Fusly 1213.
15/12	215	DO	Submitting an applic from C. R. Baynes Esq. for a piece of land on the Pulney Hills measuring 14 ground or 1430 feet adjoining that granted to him under the sanction of the Board & recommending that it may be complied

No 8 Madura Peracotah [illegible]

To

The Secy to the Bd of Rev

Sir

With ref. to Par. 3 of the Bd's Proc on the Jum[illegible] Report of 1261, calling upon me to explain in a separate Communication why a Standard of 380 Pags weight was adopted at the Survey [illegible] the measure of the Madura District was Rs 124 3/8 weight. I have the honor to transmit the following accounts Copies of Hondosee Memorandums on the Records of Cutcherry.

No. 1 - dated 16 Sept 1802 - states the measure or Puddee to be - 350 Pags. without specifying the description of Pags.

No. 2. dated May 8. 1804, relative to the Capacity of the Puddy states as follows -

Madura Tosh

1 Puddy	=	17½ Pull
1 Pull	=	20 Coolee Hoons weight
1 Puddy	=	350 Hoons Poolee

6 Puddees	=	1 Toom - 2100 Hoon weight Poolee - 25200 Coolee Hoons weight
72 do	=	1 Cullum or 12 Mercals - 184000 Hoon weight
1 Madura Garce	=	47 Cullums - (Madura)
1 do	=	

Dindigul Measure

	Madura Ture Toom	1 Puddee
	6	1¼
1 Cullum	=	65 Cullums
1 Garce	=	$13\frac{3}{16}$ Dindigul Puddee
1 Kora Puddee	=	Arcot Seers
1 Dindigul Cullum	=	$73\frac{14}{16}$ Rupee weight
1 Dindigul Puddee	=	101

The ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] of the Puddee [illegible]

1 Hoon of a Gauze = 8½ Madras Puddees

8½ do = 1 Cullum

1 Gauze = 47 Culls 2 - 4 Mamull Puddee

~~[illegible] Puddee~~ - = { 269 Hoon weight =
1 Dich Puddee { 251¼ Kulleg Hoon weight
{ 80 $\frac{12}{16}$ Rupees weight

~~[illegible]~~ Puddee = 380 Hoon weight which at the rate of 107 Hoon to the 100 Hoons of the Kulleg Puddee is = 350 Hoons weight = 112 Rupees weight

1 Madras Puddee = 400 Hoon weight which at the rate of 107 to the 100 Kulleg Hoons is = 370 Hs weight

From the above we infer that the Puddee at the Mint = 380 Hoon or Poolee the Puddee at the Bazar - and that the word Poolee at the Commencement of Paper No. 2 was a mistake for Kulleg, a ~~[illegible]~~ term still current among Goldsmiths at Madras.

The 2d Puddee of 400 Kulleg Hoons weight is entered for the first time ~~first appears~~ in an account sent to the Bd of Revenue in 1836 in reply to a Circular order calling for the weights & measures, ~~[illegible]~~ proper Hoons at 3 5¼/16 [illegible] 128 - 6/16 - thus converted at the rate of 107 Madras Hoons for 100 Kulleg Hoons & takes the Madras [illegible]

But ~~[illegible]~~ the Acct previously sent in 1822 its weight is entered as 360 Hoons, (what Hoon not stated) ~~but [illegible] supposed [illegible] Kulleg Hoons~~

In answer to a question put to the Jewellers of Madras in 1849 he stated that the Tola on which Madras is situated [illegible] the Puddee in use in Madras appeared from the [illegible] of [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] has given occasion to [illegible] & [illegible] entered in the [illegible] which [illegible] the [illegible] before the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] introduced

84

The 324 Pagos weight entered in the
[illegible] [illegible] in [illegible] of his Report must be understood
as intended for the Cutting Hoon - and will equal
[illegible] 107 to the 130 / 346 - 10 Madras weight - which
will make the [illegible] Puddee of Account 18 1/4 [illegible]
18 1/4 [illegible] of the Madras Puddee - The entry in the [illegible]
table of weights in the [illegible] Pagos is an evident [illegible] to [illegible]
The Puddee [illegible] [illegible] both in Madras
The Puddee word [illegible] the Madras Puddee [illegible] -
to [illegible] [illegible] in the Madras

J. D. V.

C

B 1

[illegible] Plaintiffs Versus D[illegible]

1 Palaniappa [illegible] Shan[illegible]

[illegible]

2 Dalavoy Vellian Shaviga[illegible]

The Plaintiffs claim under [illegible] VII of 1831 the restitution of the office of [illegible] Ambalom and of Manium land & [illegible] attached to it in the village of [illegible] in the [illegible] Talook of Pellenadom in the Zemindary [illegible] Ramnad now in the possession of the Defend[illegible] [illegible] No. 297 [illegible] the [illegible] of Swamy [illegible] due to him [illegible] from the [illegible] for the years 1848 to 1851 including the balance of the previous years.

The Plaintiffs allege that the office [illegible] to him by hereditary right, that he appointed the Defdt as his [illegible], that [illegible] the Defdt [illegible] right the Defdt [illegible] [illegible] of his right [illegible] [illegible] annually [illegible] [illegible] now [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]

The Defdt states that the office [illegible]

[illegible] continued in [illegible]

[illegible] the office [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] to

[illegible]

[illegible] the Pridhanry of [illegible]

that in the deeds to grandfather complain[illegible]

[illegible] he ordered the sale to be cancelle[d]

the money returned — that as [illegible]

[illegible] having at the same time spent the

[illegible] he [illegible] it by mortgaging the office

[illegible] to Mootoo Cara [illegible] Shanmugam — that on the

grandfather [illegible] Mootoo

[illegible] agreed in [illegible] to obtain

[illegible] making over the office to him

[illegible] grandfather his consenting to reimburse

[illegible] Mootoo [illegible] Shanmugam the money he

had advanced and that until the amount

was [illegible] should annually

[illegible] from the [illegible]

[illegible] in two [illegible]

[illegible] the office between the [illegible]

grandfather & Mootoo [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] December [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] possessed by Vyapari [illegible]

[illegible] the Deft [illegible]

[illegible] including

10

[illegible] double mortgage [illegible]

Rous 845 14 4 in cash [illegible]

[illegible] of Ambalgi and its appurtenances

the Deft also stipulating to pay 20 [illegible]

[illegible] Shanwagur annually

[illegible] subsequently in 1838 & 1842 he

[illegible] expenses. Subsequently [illegible]

[illegible] for amounts [illegible] the

right to the amount of 30 [illegible]

loans be repaid.

The Plffs endeavour to establish

their case by producing [illegible] document

[illegible] by Deft as [illegible]

[illegible] 1838 signed by Deft

The Defts produces [illegible]

prove his case

Plaintiffs Document

[illegible] agreement No 32 [illegible]

[illegible] the Deft [illegible] Plffs father [illegible] the

[illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] 1817 [illegible]

[illegible] No. 31 [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

date

[illegible] January 1817

[illegible] No. 31 from the Collector [illegible]

date

[illegible] 27th January 1817

[illegible] another do. No. 32 from do. to do. [illegible]

[illegible] August 1818

[illegible] another do. No. 33 from do. to [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 24th December 1824 C

[illegible] of an [illegible] No. 34 from do. to do. [illegible]

[illegible] 28th February 1825

X Copy of an [illegible] No. 35 from [illegible]

[illegible] the Collector under date the [illegible]

[illegible] No. 36 from the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] September 1827

[illegible] No. 37 of the do. do. date [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 19

[illegible] 1757

Copy of an Agreement [illegible]

[illegible] under date the [illegible] of [illegible]

14th September [illegible]

Copy of a Receipt [illegible] the Defend[illegible]

[illegible] Chancery [illegible]

date [illegible] 17 [illegible]

[illegible] Agreement [illegible]

[illegible] Chancery [illegible]

[illegible] the Defendant under date the 3d [illegible]

[illegible] Plaintiff [illegible]

Copy of the [illegible] to the [illegible]

[illegible] Chancery [illegible]

date the 11th [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible]

Copy of an Account [illegible]

Receipt of Money by the [illegible]

date the 22 [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 130

[illegible] receipt [illegible]

[illegible] 14 [illegible]

[illegible] No. 22 given by the Dept [illegible]

[illegible] Coll. [illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] 1830.

Copy of [illegible] No. 23 passed by [illegible]

[illegible] Dept. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Copy of [illegible]

Copy [illegible] of the Coll. [illegible]

[illegible] the Collector to the Dept. [illegible]

[illegible] 24th [illegible] 1836.

Copy of [illegible] No. 25 given by the Coll.r

Coll.r to the Dept. [illegible] the 17th [illegible] 1838.

Copy of [illegible] passed by the [illegible]

Collr. to the Dept. dated 4th May 1843

Copy of [illegible] from the [illegible]

[illegible] to the Collector [illegible]

[illegible] 1837.

[illegible] established [illegible]

[illegible] documents [illegible]

12

[illegible] and [illegible] thereto [illegible]

[illegible] 1830 for more than [illegible] years [illegible]

Emoluments. The public documents [illegible]

the engagement of the office by the Defend[ant] [illegible]

the year 1825 and by [illegible] before but the

date of it appears to have taken place before

the promulgation of Regulation [illegible] 1803 and

thereform not ^they^ been affected by that [illegible] and

that the Def[endan]t has signed official documents

as on behalf of the Plaintiff [illegible]

appears to have been [illegible]

of [illegible] having been [illegible]

[illegible] in the office of [illegible] & does not

[illegible] [illegible] vitiate [illegible] his claim

Under these circumstances [illegible]

[illegible] no reason to admit the claim of the Pl[ainti]ff

[illegible] that the assignment by the Def[endan]t of the

office & its [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the costs

[illegible]

2 Eue[illegible]

h No

Dat[illegible] [illegible] 1854

(13) No. 40

To The Secretary to the Bd. of Reve ~~[illegible]~~ R.

No. 1 By the Tipu Rules ~~Lands~~ ~~Heyhut~~ Lands waste for more than 10 years if ~~cultivated~~ planted with Topes ~~of Cocos~~ are to be held Tax free for 20 Years.

No. 20 2 By the Cowle Hookumnamah of the district, Copy of which I ~~annex~~ enclose Heyhut lands waste upwards ~~three~~ of 5 years are entitled to Cowle

3 I have the honor to request to be informed whether the Cowle according to the Hookumnamah may be allowed for the Lands planted with Topes if waste for more than 5 and less than 10 years — It appears fair that on the principle of levying [illegible] on the land without ~~[illegible]~~ reference to produce Cowle it shd be so allowed.

Ross

[illegible]
1 March 1804

No. 43

Secretary to the Board of Revenue

14

R

I have the honor to ack[nowledge]
Letter No. 191 of 1853 with copy of a Report
thereon by the Sub Collector. I concur in
his opinion that there are no peculiar
circumstances in the case of the Petitioner
to induce the Board to grant him the
indulgence of a reduction withheld from
[illegible] of topes. On the contrary as
other owners of topes [illegible]
he held his tope ~~at~~ a lower assessment
for some time by a friend's special indulgence
in his case is [illegible] the defeated

Mr. Charles's ~~[illegible]~~ opinion in favor
2 of a general reduction of the Tax on old
topes is in accordance with a recommend[ation]
which I had the honor to submit to the Board, [illegible]
in applying to a [illegible] the Board
[illegible] understand the tax on each tree
on ~~[illegible] topes [illegible]~~ is no more a tax on
[illegible] on old topes is no more Garden
improvement than the tax on old topes, and
tax on lands under [illegible] of new topes
[illegible] check the plantation of new topes
[illegible] special indulgence [illegible] and
granted to promote the object [illegible]
the correctness of his [illegible]
~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] in old topes
that the reduction of the tax on old topes

would not be found detrimental to
Revenue" Case, it seems true, be only a [illegible]
on a very comprehensive view of the Secur[illegible]
Certainly the Public Revenue will suffer in
the first instance — and the measure will [illegible]
promote ~~the planting~~ the planting of new Topes for that
is already provided for; What it will do
to encourage the ^care of^ maintenance of old Tope[s]
and by increasing the income of the own[ers]
indirectly lead to increase of Cultivation
& planting just as any ~~[illegible]~~ to
lightening of the burdens of the Agricul[tural]
Class has a tendency to do.

R. A. [illegible]

Malwana
15 March 1854

Despt. 16. 90.

No. 40

To The Secretary to the Bd of Revenue

Sir 15

With reference to the Proc of the Bd of 15 Aug 1853 I have the honor to transmit copy the Statement ~~Called~~ relative to grants of money or Land Revenue for this District which appear to ~~[illegible]~~ come within the classes enumerated in Reg No. 6 1831; and am sorry that it should have been so long delayed ~~in [illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ for the purpose of obtaining answers to requisitions sent to Ramnad & the other Zemin Talooks for lists of ~~grants~~ Charitable grants which appear to me to come under Reg XXXI of 1802 / and Reg IV of 1831 / such a small [illegible] Inams of the nature of [illegible] Inams of the nature of [illegible] &c —

Madura
20 March 1854

G. N. P.

No 49. 16

To

The Secretary to the Bd of Revenue

Sir

I have the honor to send a statement containing the information required by your Circular of the 25th April 1853 regarding weights & measures obtaining in this District.

There is great variety, as is inevitable. It is only to be accounted for by the composition of the District, consisting of the 2 great Zemindaries of [illegible] and [illegible], almost independent under the native Govt; the minor Zemindaries [illegible], and Dindigul. The Madura [illegible], though [illegible] for a long time ... [illegible] the Province of Mysore. [illegible] the Kingdom of Madura to 1760 & the weights have been introduced, and weights have [illegible] been [illegible] and [illegible] therefore to assimilate it in Custom.

&c &c

Madura
22nd March 1854

[illegible]
Despd 25 Do

Statement Shewing the Weights and Measures [illegible]

[illegible]	Measures	[illegible]	Weights	[illegible]
	1 Measure heaped =		1 Tola =	1
	1 Do. Struck =		3 Tolas = 1 Pollam	3
	6 Do. heaped = 1 Mercal		40 Pollams = 1 Viss	12
	12 Mercals = 1 Cullam		8 Viss or 240 Pollams = 1 Tolam	72
	38 Cullams 10 Mercals & 4 measures 3⁄4 Gurce	384000	8 Viss = 1 Maund	960
			10 Maunds = 1 Pody	9600
			4 Pody = 1 Bandy load	38400
			But the usual load is	
			3 1/4 Podies	31
	400 Star Pagodas Measure		24 Cuttay Pagodas = 1 Pollam	
	1 Struck measure =	120	16 Pollams = 1 Maund	16
	or 1 1/2 heaped [illegible]		100 Do. = 1 Tolam	15
	[illegible]		12 Tolams = 1 Pody or	3000
	[illegible]	137	Bullock load	
	6 Measures = 1 Mercal	822	1 Bullock load = [illegible]	3
	12 Mercals = 1 Cullam	9[illegible]		
	3700 Struck measure heaped = 1 Garce	384000		
	[illegible] Do. = 1 Pody	1645		
	1 [illegible] =	1[illegible]	1 Tola =	
	6 [illegible] = 1 Mercal	723	1 Pollam =	
	12 Mercals = 1 Cullam	8[illegible]	1 Viss or 40 Pollams =	
			24 Pagodas = 1 Pollam	
			1360 grains	
			16 1/2 Pollams = [illegible]	
			8 Viss = 1 Maund	
			20 Maunds = 1 Candy	
			1 Pollam = [illegible]	
			[illegible]	

(Left margin, vertical: Tinnevelly [illegible]; [illegible]; Ceylon)

[illegible] in use in the Districts of Madura & Dindigul [illegible]
[illegible] in Company's Rupees.

Gold Smith [illegible]	Their equivalent in Company's Rupees	[illegible] Grain [illegible]		Their equivalent in Company's Rupees	
[illegible]	R. A. P.			R. A. P.	

Grains of [illegible]		20 Cutley [illegible] = 1 Pullem	6
[illegible]		20 Pullem = 1 Maricy [illegible]	125
48 Pagoda [illegible]		12 Do. = 1 Tolam	[illegible]
¼ or 10 Cutley Fanams =		16 Tolams = 1 Pody	9000
1 Pagoda	5	4 Podies = 1 Bunj [illegible]	3[illegible]
[illegible] Pagodas weight = 1 Seer	25		
Brass, Copper &c.			
Pullem =	5		
Do. [illegible] Seer	24		
Do. = 1 [illegible]	120		
[illegible]			
[illegible]		20 Pullems = 1 Yeddy	15
[illegible] Pagoda		5 Yeddys = 1 Tolam	750
[illegible] Fanams [illegible] = 1 Cutley			
Pagoda Weight	5		
[illegible] Pagodas weight = 1 Seer	25		
1 Pagodas weight [illegible]	5		
Seer is 8 [illegible]	25 [illegible]		
		[illegible]	
8 Cutley Fanams or [illegible]		18 Pullems = 1 [illegible]	5
[illegible] = 1 Pagoda		1 [illegible]	75 [illegible]

18

33

[illegible] Pagoda [illegible] not exactly [illegible] weight & in the same proportion the value of the Pagoda [illegible] in [illegible] & Carnatic

[illegible]

Statement shewing the weights and measures [illegible]
equiv[illegible]

[illegible]	Measures	Weights	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	134	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	670	80 [illegible]	= [illegible]
12 [illegible]	2040	6 [illegible]	= 1 [illegible]
		6 [illegible]	= 1 [illegible]
		8 [illegible]	= 1 [illegible]
[illegible]	56		
8 [illegible] = 1 [illegible]	448		
[illegible]	336		

... use in the Districts of Madura & Dindigul ...
... in Company's Rupees.

Gold Smiths	Their equivalent in Company's Rupees	... to be ...	Their equivalent in Company's Rupees

19

Statement Shewing the weights and measures [illegible]

Taluk	[illegible]	[illegible]	Weights	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible] of Village [illegible]

[illegible]

...in use in the Districts of Madura & Dindigul ...
...in Company's Rupees.

Gold Smith's ...	Their equivalent in Company's Rupees	... to be given ...	Their equivalent in Company's Rupees
	R. A. P.		R. A. P.

209

Statement shewing the weights and measure[s] [illegible]
equi[valent] [illegible]

Taluk	[illegible]	Weights in [illegible]	Weights	[illegible]
		[illegible]		[illegible]

[illegible]			
[illegible]	[illegible]		
[illegible]	[illegible]		
[illegible] = [illegible]	576	[illegible]	
[illegible] = [illegible]	456		
[illegible] = 16 [illegible]	5472		
The measures used by [illegible]			
[illegible]	126	20 Pagodas = 1 [illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible] = [illegible]	315	[illegible]	
[illegible] = 1 [illegible]	3780	24 Pagodas = [illegible]	24
[illegible] = 1 [illegible]	15120	3 [illegible] = 1 [illegible]	[illegible]
		[illegible] = 1 [illegible]	
		8 [illegible] = 1 [illegible]	
		[illegible] = 1 [illegible]	
The [illegible] by [illegible] [illegible]			
[illegible] following [illegible]			
[illegible]	38		
[illegible]	218		
[illegible] = [illegible]	3816		
[illegible]			
[illegible]			
[illegible]			
[illegible]			
[illegible] = 1 [illegible]	212		
[illegible]	3392		
[illegible] = 1 [illegible]			
[illegible] = 1 [illegible]	20352		
[illegible]			
[illegible]			

... use in the Districts of [illegible] & [illegible] ...
... in Company's Rupees.

Goldsmith [illegible]	Specie equivalent in Company's Rupees	[illegible] Specie	Specie equivalent in Company's Rupees	
	[illegible]		[illegible]	

21

Statement showing the weights and measures [illegible]

Taluks	Measures	[illegible]	Weights	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

Madras 22nd March [illegible]

... use in the Districts of Madura & Dindigul & ...
... in Company's Rupees.

Gold Smiths	Their equivalent in Company's Rupees	[illegible]	Their equivalent in Company's Rupees	
	Rs. [illegible]		Rs. [illegible]	

22

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible]

Boundary of the

Rowe & Spencer

John Gray

Dated 23

March 1834

Act of Weights &

Measures in use

in the District &

in Dependancies

Goldsmiths Soomeragalam

43

17 grains of Shumba per 24 — a Fondor Manna or a poonnavadai ... paper
... poonnavadai — 1 Rallai pagoda weight or 8 Annas
~~24 Rallai pagodas~~ — 1 pallam or 7 8
160 pagodas weight — 1 Seer or 25 lbs

2 ~~Other Mark & garden stuff~~

Gruff goods

24 Rallai pagodas — 1 pallam or 7 8
16 pallams — 1 Measure small or 120
100 pallams — 1 Tolam or 750
12 Tolam — 1 Puddy or bullock load
4 Bullock loads — 1 Cart load

Wool & cotton & garden stuff

10 pullams — 1 Puddy or 150 lbs
... Puddis — 1 Tolam 750

~~dry~~ grain & wet measure

... Mora Puddas or 120 lbs — one Measure short measure or ... paper is ...
... Measures or 720 — one Mercal — ... measure ... 137
... Mercals or 9740 — one Cullam
... Measures or — one Garce
... Measures or — one Porky

Goldsmiths Madarah

16 grains of paddy ... — a Fondor Manai or one poonnavadai or 1/... pagoda
16 D°
6 ... or 10 Kalli fanams — one pagodas weight or 5 lbs
40 Pagodas weight — one Seer or 25 lbs

Gruff goods

4 ... — one Visse — 40 pallams a visse or 120
3 ... — one pullam 3 lbs — 6 visse one Tolam 1 Tolam 720

[illegible] one Maund 960

10 Maunds one [illegible] 9600

[illegible] 1 Bunch [illegible] the usual [illegible] 3 per [illegible] 38[illegible]

(36060)

~~[illegible]~~

Cotton & Grain Vegetables

20 Cotton [illegible] weight one Pullow 6 [illegible]

20 pullows 1 [illegible] measures heaped 125

120 pullows or 1 [illegible] 7.50 lbs

12 [illegible] or a [illegible] 9,000 lbs

4 [illegible] or one bunch 8[illegible]

[illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ & [illegible] Measures heaped 135 flat 120

8 Measures heaped 1 Mercal 810

12 Mercal 1 Culloo 9720

30 cullows 1 Mercal & 4 measures 1 [illegible] or 2,800 heaped or flat 3,200

Brass Copper &

3 lbs make one pullow

8 Pullows one Seer or 24

5 Seers one [illegible] or 120

9720
[illegible]
29160
6480
35640
8100

810
648
10
8100

No. 54.

The Secretary to the Board of Revenue

Minute of the Proceedings of the Bd dated the 11 April and 6 June 1853

I have the honor to transmit a Statement Exhibiting in detail [illegible] of Services of Incomes (see annexure) of the district and Incomes below 2 Co[illegible] [illegible] against [illegible] also the total [illegible] of the latter the Centage of the former to the latter will be observed to be only 1 14/16 ~~which from~~

~~I think that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]~~

~~[illegible] [illegible] Incomes will~~

~~Incomes below 2 [illegible] inconsiderable, but~~

~~therefore be inconsiderable. I think it very~~

~~as a general measure~~

~~desirable~~ I think the exemption of the Incomes below 2 [illegible] Enquiry of Incomes below ~~[illegible]~~ highly desirable. ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] as the [illegible] to [illegible] to the labour disproportionate to such investigations [illegible] which are generally difficult & [illegible] are moreover liable to [illegible]

as such Inquiry was hitherto [illegible]

but a practical difficulty [illegible]

the incumbents became scattered

and in search of subsistence and

~~[illegible]~~ is

it is consequently very difficult

to procure the attendance of

persons from whom information

is required. It may perhaps

be desirable for the ~~Govt~~ to

ascertain ~~[illegible]~~ whether the

sanction of property the ~~[illegible]~~

officers from taking such ~~[illegible]~~

Examinations for that the facts of

the death of the incumbent and

the residence of some person on

the spot with ~~some~~ a colour of pretension

to succeed should be reported

to the Govt, and that he should

submit ~~such~~ a statement of

such as are ~~[illegible]~~ notoriously

without Claimants for vacant

Ross

Madras }
25 March 1856 }

25

...tement showing the extent of Rent-free Enam lands below 2 Cawnies in the District of [illegible]

[illegible]	Talook's	Nunjah Land Cawnies	as	Tax Rs	as	ps	Poonjah Land Cawnies	as	Tax Rs	as	ps	Total Land Cawnies	as	Tax Rs	as	ps
Davadayem	Madacolem	84	5¼	573	9	-	[illegible]	9¼	219	-	1	103	14¼	[illegible]12	9	1
	Tiroomungalem	58	8¾	555	5	5	1[illegible]5	13½	353	7	9	262	6¼	938	13	8
	Meylore	42	2	178	-	10	24	7½	43	8	11	66	9½	221	9	9
	Thenkunnay	52	4	415	5	5	61	2½	157	12	11	[illegible]3	5½	573	1	6
		267	4	1742	5	2	363	3¼	803	12	10	630	40/4	2546	2	"
Brimadayem	Madacolem	112	2¾	789	13	7	311	14	31	5	5	124	¾	81	3	"
	Tiroomungalem	36	3¾	258	8	7	22	13¼	48	9	2	159	3	307	1	11
	Meylore	8	9½	44	12	1	-	-	-			[illegible]	9½	44	12	1
	Ramangalathenkury	57	15¼	484	6	5	-	7	-	10	2	58	6¾	495	-	7
		214	15¼	1577	8	0	35	4¼	80	8	11	250	4	1658	11	7
Miscellaneous	Madacolem	31	8¼	199	2	-	43	¼	148	10	7	74	8½	347	12	7
	Tiroomungalem	7	8¼	54	-	14	10	15¼	31	2	6	18	8	85	3	4
	Meylore	12	12	52	11	10	16	2¼	31	13	9	28	14¼	84	9	7
	Thenkunnay	23	2	212	14	6	8	2¾	17	13	3	31	4¾	230	11	9
		74	14½	518	13	2	78	5	229	8	1	153	3½	748	5	3
	Total	557	2½	3838	11	"	476	9¾	1113	13	10	1033	12¼	4952	8	10
Davadayem	Taudicombos	12	1	75	14	6	97	13¾	279	15	5	109	14¾	[illegible]	13	11
	Eyenpully	36	12¾	215	7	2	49	2½	49	"	7	85	15	264	7	9
	Kellacotay	8	14¾	69	5	3	111	10¾	386	9	8	120	9½	455	14	11
	Ramagherry	36	2¼	182	3	4	83	1	144	11	11	119	3¼	326	15	3
		93	14¾	542	14	[illegible]	341	11¾	660	5	7	435	10½	1403	3	10
Brimadayem	Taudicombos	9	13¼	99	9	"	9	11¾	29	14	1	19	9	129	7	1
	Eyenpully	3	3¾	20	5	6	3	2½	15	15	8	6	6¼	3[illegible]	5	2
	Kellacotay	5	2½	59	10	10	3	[illegible]	19	13	2	8	5¾	[illegible]	8	"
	Ramagherry	16	8	60	14	4	5	2¾	17	1	9	21	10¾	78	-	1
		34	11½	240	7	8	21	¼	8	12	8	55	15¾	323	4	4
Miscellaneous	Taudicombos	3	15½	31	9	9	[illegible]	13¼	46	2	6	10	6¼	77	12	3
	Eyenpully	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Kellacotay	1	4¼	9	1	7	1	9¾	19	1	3	2	14	28	7	10
	Ramagherry	1	½	3	15	10	34	4¼	57	12	11	35	4¾	63	12	9
		6	4¼	44	1	2	42	4½	125	5	8	49	9	170	-	10
	Total	134	14¼	828	1	1	405	4¼	[illegible]	7	11	540	2¼	189[illegible]	9	4
	Grand Total	692	[illegible]	[illegible]66	12	[illegible]	881	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	15½	[illegible]840		10

Total Enam [illegible] of the District [illegible]
844 - 12¾ - [illegible] - 12 - 8

13 Feby/54

[illegible signature]

Letter Vill found

27

827

Tabular Report
of lapse of Enam
in the Villages of
Chinnamanoor
in Thevkaniy

Tabular Report on the [illegible] Enam [illegible] District of Madura

Case No.	Talook and Village in which situated and extent of the Enam	When and by whom granted, names of the original grantees and the documents in support of grant	Nature of the grant, Charity or Service, if Ser. the nature of the duty prescribed by the grant	Name of the last holder, date of his decease and the relationship in which he stood to the original grantee	How [illegible] by the [illegible] and the heirs [illegible]	Names, ages by the deceased, names and ages of the parties, their circumstances and the means of subsistence possessed by them	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Thurkumay Talook Chinnamanoor Village Nunjah 1 Cawnytar [illegible] as 7 : ed at 8-9-6-	Granted to [illegible] by Polaun [illegible] & by whom is not known during Carnatic Government no Sunnud - but in the Survey acct of Fusly 1211 the Enam is entered "Sellondy Polaun [illegible] Enam" Maniem and the [illegible] of Polaun is a [illegible]	There is no mention of the Nature of the grant in the Survey acct. It appears from enquiry that the duty of the grantee was to disguise himself as an actor & dance on the occasion of the festival of the Village Deity	Alagherry moottoo died on the 16 Octr 1850 - He was the son of Sellondy [illegible]	He enjoyed the Entire Enam	Sellamoottoo Son [illegible] -ed- 40 yrs; Ummanee his wife 20; Caroopayee widow of the deceased 60; 3. [illegible] means of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] subsistence except the	[illegible] in the accounts from 1211 down [illegible] the Maniem is [illegible] [illegible], and from [illegible] [illegible] it [illegible] [illegible] Enams of [illegible] nevertheless [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] & Pillay under [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] - [illegible] 1852 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] The Collector [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that it was [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Rep. Enamd

Madura
May 12th 1852

No 76   2d   Madura 28 April 1854

To the Secy to the Bd of Revenue   R

56

I have the honor to submit for the orders of the Board of Revenue the accompanying copy of a letter from the Sub Collector of Madura recommending that a party who ... above 100 ... are [illegible] of [illegible] ... have constructed tanks, which collected Rain water, which would otherwise run to waste, should be exempted from any addl. taxation on the wet land irrigated therefrom.

2   I beg to support the recommendation, the construction of these particular tanks ... the exclusion of the privilege such as the encouragements accorded by the orders of 30 Octr of the 1st Feb 1852 to those [illegible] of improvements, being [illegible] to the danger of new tanks being built to intercept channels now flowing to old established Tanks. I think it [illegible] with the precedents ... be required that before the construction should be first commenced ... sanction of the Local Authorities – [illegible]

Regular Lands this is now the
fixed Rule of the District [illegible]

Rep. the
~~The~~ [illegible] question [illegible]
~~it more of the~~

3 This Question leads
me to enquire whether the
Board have come to any
determination as to the Lines
to be held out in lieu of
Discoverdium Grants for
the Construction of [illegible] Lands

No 91 Madura Periacolam 2nd June 1854

To The Secy to the Board of Reve. Ry

30

1 With reference to Para 4 of the Bd Proc dated the 8th May 1854 I have the honor to enquire whether when there is no local supply of water in the reservoir for the cultivation of a second crop the board intend the Ryots to have the option of raising a second crop of dry grain without payment of Tax, as the Board are of opinion that irrigation to a small amount is often applied to Nunjah land; with reference to Para 82 of the Board's orders, these are in accordance with the long established practice of the district and not new propositions of my own.

2 Para 83 of the Board's orders was framed under the impression granted by the Boards Proceedings of the 4 May 1848, and its language was intended to guard against its being construed to include Poonjah taxes on Nunjah land rendered in all respects similar to the original Punjah assessment. Sometimes however the Ryots have the right to

of a casual supply of water. Such as would be
afforded by a larger quantity than usual
flowing over the Calingula[?] through any
Surplus weir. ~~[illegible]~~ or
a new [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ appearing in
a heavy monsoon the next year probably
becomes
the supply fails. and if the land ~~[illegible]~~
~~[illegible]~~ once accidentally Cultivated
with [illegible], be always considered as
such, and ~~[illegible]~~
be liable to a [illegible] [illegible]
~~[illegible]~~ if cultivated
Teerwa, if ~~[illegible]~~ it would sooner
unformally with [illegible], it would seem
be as good as lost, for it must lie
waste from inability to bear the Tax —
& some Cases of equal hardship will be
when [illegible] enterprising Ryots construct
a Tank which after a year of two
Besides
proves a ~~failure~~ — ~~[illegible]~~
they will lose
their money & their land. because
it will ~~become~~ have become subj
to a higher tax that it can bear

3 In the Southern divisions
Ankeabuseo where from the vicinity to
the mountains these casual supplies
are more frequent than in the eastland
plains of Madura, it has been usual
for the Sub Collector to receive applications
for permission to cultivate Nunjah lands
with Poonjah and to authorize the
abatement of the tax on Nunjah land
Poonjah or Poonjah Rate as he might
consider adequate under the circumstances

4 The Board observe, in Para
3. " of the Poonjah Waraoos Nunjah has been
" brought into the Account as part of
" the Permanent Nunjah Payment
which we infer that there may be
Poonjah Waraoos Nunjah not brought
into the Permanent Payment - It is
possible therefore that they may
contemplate some other mode of Entry
for such casual - [illegible]
Poonjah Waraoos Nunjah as those
alluded to above - and I shall feel
obliged by being informed of such [illegible]

or whether they were alive. Para 83 of the proposed Boohoorie manual to be then under his Consideration. Instructions were required also as to the ~~[illegible]~~ Continuance in future of the discretion mentioned in Para as merum of the Dividing ~~[illegible]~~ orders

~~[illegible]~~

5 The difference of practice stated in Para 82 of the Draft Boohoorie manual proceeds from there having been a Tegsil Moongah [illegible] Boongah Teerwa Dettum (established lately) in some villages and not in others. Where such a [illegible] exists it shd I think be continued and ~~[illegible]~~ no Moongah Teerwa charged in other villages ~~[illegible]~~

Whatever may be the custom of Moongah [illegible] Boongah Crops grown, only a single Moongah [illegible] Boongah Teerwa will be levied in obedience to the [illegible] instructions -

Ans'd 6 July

32/

No. 95

Rohilkund
9th June 1859

To The Secretary to the Board of Reve

I have the honor to request [illegible] of the Board have laid down [illegible] rules in regard to the course to be pursued in cases where Poonjah lands have been converted to Nunjah by means of water from Govt. reservoirs.

In some instances the Zemindars are willing to pay the difference between the Poonjah and the Nunjah revenue to the Sircar and it wd be just to exact it; but instructions are requisite how to carry such difference to account.

In other cases where the Poonjah lands ~~Nunjah~~ converted to Nunjah belongs to a body remunerated village Officers it wd be inexpedient to allow him to enjoy the whole benefit; but some Regulation on the subject seems to be necessary.

Sirs

Yrs &c

No. 105

32

63

To Secreta[ry]

Board of [Revenue]

Fort [St. George]

Sir

Rd/

I have the h[onor] to report

for the information of the Board of

Revenue the death on the [...] January of

[...] of Commissoring [...]

Zemindar of Jethelnaick

paying an annual Peshcush of

Rupees 1070-3-11 - The deceased,

succeeded to the Estate on the death

of Soobaiya Jothelnaick nephew

of Commissoring Jethelnaick as

will be seen by the correspondence

to 1826 Aug [illegible]
from [illegible] 5 Sept

[illegible] leaving [illegible] 6

[illegible] of the age of [illegible]

[illegible] Mootoosawmy

[illegible] the widow Meena[illegible]
younger
[illegible] the brother of the

[illegible] Nulla Marikar Naik

[illegible] the estate may be

left in charge [illegible] till

the [illegible] comes of age

I have the honor to re-

quest instructions of the

Board of Revenue as to whether

I am permitted to recognize

Mootoosawmy Jokel Naik

as Poligar [illegible] the adoption

38

of the arrangement [illegible]

65

there — there is no [illegible]

the Estate.

There is no Balance

against the Estate —

Beg to recommend [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

recognized as [illegible]. And [illegible]

the Estate left during the [illegible]

in charge of his [illegible] [illegible]

according to their Requests

[illegible]

Madura
29 June
1864

to the 1829 Nov.

[illegible] Madras July 1852

The Secy to the Board of Rev.

Re Conversion

Sir I be[illegible] in returning the accounts Petn offered to me for report [illegible] the honor to state that the Yomiah in question was originally granted to Gholam Ally Shah Sahe or Dervish during the rule of the Nabobs, and it is entered in the name of that person in the Huzzoor accounts of Fusly 1212 the [illegible] year and 1217 when there was an examination of Enams — In Fusly 1229 the name was changed in the Village account to Yacoob Khan, the father of Mahomed Yacoob against whom Petr complains, and in this [illegible] it continued till Fusly 1262 1852/53, when it was changed to Mahomed Yacoob.

It is an admitted fact that Gholam Saheb had no son but 4 or 5 daughters of whom it [illegible] certain that only 2 had issue viz Husain Beebee and [illegible] Beebee to whom the Nabob granted a Yomiah of 1/2 per diem of which in 1824 the Government

... ...

... ...

Mahommed Yacoof ... Mr. Peter ...

... the sons of Hossain Beebee

and ... Beebee respectively and are entered,

the former as 25 years and the latter

as 50 years old. That the Mahommed Yacoof

therefore could not be the Individual of that name

Yacoof now alive, who is not more than

45 at the present time, but was his father

commonly called as before stated Yacoof

Khan.

3 At the time of Gholam Ally

Khan ... death which, notwithstanding

the entry of his name in the Village accounts

so late as 1228 ... I conclude from his

daughters having obtained Zomeeah from

the ... took place ... that Governi

... was a child and

Yacoof ... the eldest male of the

... naturally therefore had

charge

36

Charge of the Enaum and it was entered in his name. He died, his son says, between the time of Mr. Peter's recom-mendation and the Government sanction of the Yomiah in his name. Syed Khan then became the Senior Member, and as is admitted managed the landed property giving Mahomed Yacoof ½ the produce.

4. For some years, however it is allowed to have been in possession of Mahomed Yacoof, but as regards the number of years and the mode in which it was transferred, the greatest discrepancy prevails in the ~~respective~~ statements of the parties — a discrepancy which I have been unable to clear up by means of Witnesses. The Enamdars do not themselves cultivate the lands, and as they used to share the produce equally, the Ryots of the Village cannot state positively who

Contd.

Cannot be considered to be in possession.

Mahomed Yacoob asserts that Lall Khan

~~Khan ... ...~~

~~by asserting that Lall Khan is not~~

~~... ...~~

the son of Hoosainee Beebee, but only

adopted by her, and that his real mother

was his the Yaomadars Father's sister,

and that ~~according to~~ the Mahomedan not being entitled to the Enam under

law, ~~the adoption would not give him a~~ he gave it up to him when he arrived at man's estate

~~right to the Enam~~. This assertion in

consequence of the great age of Lall Khan

is now ~~incapable of proof and being~~

contradicted by the entry in Mr Peters

Statement in 1824 alluded to above, must

I think be rejected.

Lall Khan, on the other

hand ~~asserts~~ alleges that he had possession

till 1848 when he went to a mar-

riage and Patt usurped ~~it~~ Khan. If this

were strictly true why did he not to

complain till 1851?

The truth of the matter

I take to be this, that when Lall

Khan

32

Khan was growing old, Mahomed Yacoof managed the land and would have continued to do so without any complaint, had he not lately denied the right of Land Khan to ½ share on the ~~ground~~ pretence of his being an [illegible] of [illegible] Son-

8 In equity I consider them both entitled to share equally, and if the division of such Enam were permitted, I would recommend that the should be so settled - If this cannot be allowed, I see no resource but to leave it, as at present in possession of Mahomed Yacoof, in whose Father's name it was entered in the accounts & who is now in possession

9 As the Mahomed Yacoof now receiving the Yeomiah of ½ F. is not the Individual named in Mr. Pyter's list, and the Continuance thereof to him has not been regularly sanctioned

[illegible] through Dr. Blackburne.

[illegible] Certificate in 1841 [illegible]

~~[illegible] record which have been [illegible]~~

~~allowed~~, I shall submit the ~~subject~~ usual

~~of its Continuance to the Board in~~

~~separate report~~ - Tabular Returns

for the orders of the Board

~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

As regards the [illegible] the Board

[illegible] or [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] 1823 [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

in 1841, Dr. Blackburne [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] 254 - [illegible]

38

[illegible] been [illegible] for the

[illegible] about the

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] under [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] whether the [illegible]

by [illegible] state of [illegible]

73

~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

whether [illegible] the

[illegible]

of the [illegible]

[illegible] for the [illegible]

having be [illegible] for [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] by [illegible]

[illegible]

To [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the first [illegible]

[illegible] by which the [illegible]

of any [illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] by the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] which [illegible]

No. 111 Madura 4 July 1854

To The Secretary to the Bd. of Reve.

Sir

With ref. to the correspce. noted in the margin, I have the honor to state, that the Presenter of the accompanying 3 Petitions Nos. 675 - 867 - 1265 / 1853 is the son of Ramaswamy Naick[illegible] Lavan. the son by affinity, and alleged adopted son of Seenagammy Nacheear daughter of the deceased Zemindar of Ramnad; on whose death, the villages of Sellamundal ? enjoyed by her in Enaum were assumed by Govt on the ground that she had no legal heirs.

- Ex. Bd. 31st July 1849 No. 87
- From Do 27th August Do
- Ex. Do 22d Jany 1850 No. 6
- Ex. Do 25th March Do No. 33
- From Do 30 May Do
- Ex. Do 1st April 1851 No. 35
- From Do 12 June Do

2 In these villages she held some lands ~~[illegible]~~ or "Pannay" or under the Govt share in her own hands "Pannay" - ~~[illegible]~~ lands has ~~[illegible]~~ of the produce of these lands has been assumed, as portion of the Enaum, and the Extra money tax "Varee" paid by all the other Ryots of the villages has also been [illegible] ~~for~~ them, for ~~[illegible]~~ but the right of Cultivation ~~has been~~ ~~[illegible]~~ was made over to the Petr. because his father was Seenagammy husband & she ~~[illegible]~~ lived with her ~~and she left a will~~ and actually so ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] as her adopted son though he was not.

3 The Petr. wishes the remission of the "Varee". but I am opposed to the concession because it is paid by all the other Ryots; and

because it being equally with the Inclosures a part of the recognized tax on the land, he might hereafter build an argument upon of a claim to the Ramnad Zemindary on its being remitted to him.

4 He also claims some Cannot & Ambalam Inams enjoyed by Sevagunga Nachear — I cannot ascertain how the latter became possessed of these

By a Petn. to the Colln. herewith Sent. dated 18 June 84

Endowments; but as they form no part of the Govt. Revenue or the income of a Zemindary as a Zemindary I would beg to recommend that I may be authorized to make them over to the Rt. as a property similar in character to the personal goods & Woodsworrum of the late Sevagunga Nachear. I do not perceive how the Govt. can with propriety be owners of such property: and among other claimants this person would seem to me the preferable.

5 As he has performed no duties as Ambalacaren & Cannicaper during the time the income of these Inams has been taken by Govt. I see no necessity for paying him the mesne profits.

I would, however, beg to

W

support his application for payment &c

~~the [illegible] of the [illegible]~~

of the Swamp bogam of from the "Punnay" land during the time

it was under Circar Management

from July 1261. when rented out

Authority by the Collector & the

Authority by the Collector & the

28 March 1853. when they were

made over by me. the Sir do not

take Swamp bogam from the Patent Rights

in General. It was paid by the Actual

Cultivators of these Punnay lands, because ~~[illegible]~~

the right to the Rodewaram, belonged

to Sevaram Vachans. and that right

has been made over to the Pt. the

* Acc. ~~[illegible]~~ is 59-4-7 as shown in

the enclosed statement, which having

been carried to the Acc. of Sir Vencis

the Sanction of that Authority for its

disbursement

L.O.R.

* credited for 59-4-7 L.O.R.

To Board of
Revenue dated
4th July 1854.

Statement shewing the proceeds from the Rummay & lands of Sevagamy Chatty of Ramnad.

Items	Fusly 1261 Quantity of Grain			Fusly 1261 Value			Fusly 1262 Quantity of Grain			Fusly 1262 Value			Total Quantity of Grain			Total Value		
				Rs.	A.	P.				Rs.	A.	P.				Rs.	A.	P.
Sawmy bogum or Land -Lords fee on Rummay lands	14	14	1 14/16	20	2	8	21	7	3/4	34	6	11	36	0	5 2/16	54	9	7

EV

Rs

Exd.

[illegible] 1254 }

[illegible]

Collr.

Enclosure in letter
to Board of Rev.
Dated 4 July /54

No. 117

42

81

To

The Secretary to the Bd of Reve

Sir

In returning the accompg Petn No. 1621/1854

I have the honor to state that the assertions of the Petr having been duly enquired into by the local authorities were found to be quite false. The Moozoomdar entrusted to him Rs 12-9-9 to convey to the Talook Cutcherry on the 17 Decr 1850. When he came there it was not forthcoming, and he admitted his responsibility and gave an agreement that he wd receive from the Curnum 2-4 Rs as which he had given to him for his expenses and make good the rest.

~~The Petr complains with no~~

I have &c

Madura

Poodoocottah

19th July 1854

43

No. 129

Aus'd 21 Aug/54

83

To

The Sub Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

Sir,

With reference to the Correspondence

To Bd. of Rev. 8th Augt. 1846
From Do. 21st Janry. 1847
From Do. 15th March Do.
To Do. 22d Do. Do.
From Do. 24th June Do.
To Do. 18th July 1848
From Do. 17th Augt. Do.
To Do. 23d Do. Do.
From Do. 12th October Do.
To Do. 23d March 1849

noted in the Margin, I have the honor to transmit translate of a Plaint preferred by one ... ... in the Subordinate Court of Madura and a Petition from the Defendants & request to be informed whether I should apply to be made a supplemental Deft. the land having been purchased by Defendants from my Predecessor Mr. Blackburn

2 The Plaff has purchased the Claim of the sons of Vengoo Naik who were the Petitioners to the Board of Revenue & Government

AW

Madura
Poodoocottah
10th Augt. 1854

Translation of a Petition addressed to the Collector of Madura by the Defendant in case No 28 of 1854 of the file of the Civil Court viz - Tirupenthatan Rowten son of Abroolatiar Rowten (No of the ground 370) 1st Deft - (No of the ground 371) 2d Deft (no name but No 371) Meera Rowten 3d Deft (No 372) Vitcha Rowten 4th Deft (No 373) Meera Mahomed Rowten 5th Deft (No 375) (No 374) - Chenaylee 6th Deft (No 376) Kathar Rowten 7th Deft Rowten and Seedai persons residing at 8th Deft (No 377) - north of the Town in the street Gate, Madura

1st Mr Blackburn 2d

caused the following grounds
to be sold (~~each~~ giving the ex=
tent of each at 40 feet E to W
and 60 feet N to S.), and thus
secured an income to Govern=
ment. The grounds amounted
in all to about 6,000 embra
cing 3,000 numbers. They are
as follows. The grounds
bounded on the west by the
high road leading to the
Vepery river, on the north
by the Arcopannadee Channel,
on the south by the high
road leading to Teppacollam,
and on the east by Rāhoye
Mudalabeens. Also the grounds
situated on the East and
West sides of the said road,
called

45

called Verandahotte land,
and the grounds which be-
came available after the fort
were demolished. We, in
common with others, purchased
some grounds, and paid
the value thereof into the
Taloch Treasury in 1842,
and obtained Receipts for
such payment. On the 22d
February of that year (1842)
a Proclamation was made,
directing the people to con-
struct sloped tiled Verandahs
in the front and substantial
brick-in-Chunam houses
in the rear of the grounds.
The inhabitants formed
their

their buildings accordingly &
obtained Grants for them,
and duly paid the rents
thereof. Previous to the con=
struction of the East Market,
an order was given that
the ditches (within our
grounds) ten yards deep,
should be filled in & levelled;
and this we executed by
levying a contribution at
the rate of 70 Rupees per
ground. During a period
of 13 years, vizt from 1842
to 18[illegible]4, we spent a great
deal in order to build
substantial houses which
we now continue to occupy.

2nd That Plaint has
been

24

been, however, preferred in
the abovementioned No. 28
on the file of the [illegible] Court,
by our adversary Gooroosammy
Sastry, on behalf of Seenee
=vasaga Naik (who has no
claim whatever) claiming
the recovery, from us, of the
grounds we have built
upon and their rents,
amounting in all to 3000
Rupees, - on the plea that
we had purchased the
grounds in question from
him (Seeneevasaga Naik)
in 1853. With reference
to this Plaint a Notice
was issued to us. We
gave

ing and Answer to the effect
that with reference to our
former Petition, an abstract
of the proceedings in the
case should be sent for
and the Collector be considered
as the Defendant in the
Suit, and not we. Sub=
sequently upon the 24th June present year a Notice was
served on us, on the appli=
cation of the Plaintiffs, pro=
hibiting the construction
of half built or unfinished
Houses.

3rd. Grounds assigned Lastly,
the Public is well aware
that the ground in question
were purchased by us from

Govt.

63

Government thro' the late
Collector and yourself and
that we spent a great deal
for buildings thereon. Yet
he is an authorized Vakeel,
acquainted with the Rules
and Regulations, but likes
to turn a truth into false
hood and vice versa. The
Collector had written a letter
to Government on the 8th
August 1846 that the ground
cannot be interfered with
in any way; and that
should even the ~~Plaintiff~~ Petitioner
~~in the said No. 28~~
in the case resort to the
Civil Court, he (the Collector)
will

will of course be answerable
for the consequences. With
reference to this Letter and
to the Notice dated 12th April
1848, No. 304, and all other
Proceedings connected there
with, we beg your honor
will favorably be pleased
to order a letter to be writ-
ten to the Sub Court with
a request ~~that~~ to include
your honor as a Deft.
in the suit and to per-
mit us to complete our
unfinished houses.

The mark of Seneekatta Rowten
Do. Moolatoo Lubbay
Do. Patcha Rowten
Do. Sudoo Meera Rowten
Meera Rowten
The mark of Neinah Mohomado
Do. Ibraghey Rowten
Do.
Do. Mastan Rowten

1st July
1854.

48

Translate of a plaint preferred by the Plaintiff in the Sub court of Madura

43

Plaintiff

Gooroswamy Shastry son of Parashooram Shastry and Vakeel in the Zillah Court of Madura

Defendants

Shunick ... Rowten son of Moodalya Zaway Rowten of Madura, 1 Moodalya Zaway Rowten 2 ... Pecha Rowten ... ten 3 ... Eboochy ... Rowten 5. ... Rowten ... Rowten 6. ... Shady ... Rowten ... Shastree ... Lingum Pillay 10

This action is brought by the Plaintiff to recover from the Defendants ... 4 grounds situated within the ... forcibly ... of 600 Rs worth ... from August ... 143 hereunder given ... paid ... 154 possessed by the latter ... the amount of rent, there ...

... date ... restored to his
the ... possession
1st ... the whole land lying east of
the passage leading to the Vigapay river from
the northern street in Madura Town,
south of the Arroppanady channel, west
of the garden of Shockalingum Pillay & c.
north of the road leading to the Tappoculam
Tank and of Ramackayee Inundapam
as well as of a working place of the Black-
smith situated on the ground of the said
Shockalingum Pillay & had belonged to
... Jumk ... deceased and his son Shee-
... Jumk of Madura from whom
the 2. 3d. 5th 6th 7th Defts and the father's
of ... & 4th Defts obtained some portion
of land above stated on the condition of paying
... thereon, executing a deed
... that they would live
... built thereon and
deliver

deliver [illegible] their the portion [illegible]
owner of them [illegible] [illegible] they
accordingly reside there [illegible] [illegible] small
houses and the working place of the
blacksmiths thereon and paid the
rent due on them monthly - The other
portions attached to the said land were
in the enjoyment of the said Sreenivas Naik
till 1843 from his having planted trees
in some places and left some sites under
the charge of the other persons to inhabit
there. The Plaintiff having purchased
all the ground [illegible] [illegible]
situated within the following boundaries of
belonging to the said land and having gotten a
deed of purchase from the said Sreenivas
[illegible] Naik [illegible] on the 13th January 18[illegible]
possesses the right [illegible] them.

2d Of the land situated [illegible] the
limits above described, one ground [illegible]
[illegible] and consisting of [illegible] 2380 feet [illegible] the
[illegible] and
square of 14 feet from east [illegible]

to [illegible] was used by

the Sub Principal to

[illegible] this District for public [illegible]

[illegible] 4 grounds marked B, C, D, E, &

[illegible] respectively 2400 feet being the

[illegible] 120 feet from east to west and

160 from north to south; 9120 square feet

of 152 from east to west and 60 from north

to south; 596 square feet of 37 from east to

west and 16 from north to south, and 129 6/16

square feet of 28¾ from east to west and

[illegible] from north to south, were fraudulently

[illegible] from the said Principal &c.

by the Defts from 1st to 10th (who had, [illegible]

[illegible] there without [illegible] before, paying rents due

[illegible] as above stated) and they (Defts) built

houses and the working places of the

[illegible] thereon [illegible] grounds, and

[illegible]

3rd, The said Street was built

[illegible] petition to Mr. Blackburn

the

the Law & Prince ... 16th
August 1843 stating that ... that
50
cannot interfere with the grounds which
be possessed by the might of ... pur-
chased them, to which the ... papers
an endorsement informing that the
said grounds belonged to the ...
Agent Madoo or Ditch and therefore
their use has been made as above
stated –
6th On a petition presented by
the said Streenevas Naik to the
Civil Engineer on the 20th January 184[illegible]
requesting him to cause the measurement
of the said grounds disputed and to
ascertain whether they belonged to the
Ditch or not, he was good enough to
to cause the measurement of them and
to give an endorsement ... that
they did not belong to ... Naik ...
5th ... Ramaya ... Naik possession
of the said Streenevas ...
4

... [illegible] ... respectively
... 1844, 25th Octr. and [illegible]
[illegible] of the same year complaining
that the grounds which, it is evident
from the [illegible] of the Civil
Engineering [illegible] belong to the Dutch [illegible]
were [illegible] by Mr Black
[illegible] the late Principal Collr. to the
[illegible] who attempted to build houses
thereon (the grounds) and requesting
that the (the grounds) might be restored
to them (the said [illegible])
which petitions were referred to the Collr.
[illegible] On the petition again addressed
by the [illegible] to
the [illegible] the 16th December of the
above year 1844, the Board were pleased
to [illegible] thereon directing
the said [illegible] to produce
before the Collr. any documents if they had
[illegible] regarding their right to the
[illegible] grounds and stating that if their
above

above [illegible] Coll[illegible] [illegible]med by

the said documents [illegible] the [illegible]

Streem[illegible]

tiffs are desirous to [illegible] [illegible] faction.

57

7th The said Streemwa[illegible]

presented a petition again to [illegible] Collr.

on the 6th June /45, producing before

him the documents to support their

claims to the above grounds and [illegible]

Collector directed the [illegible]

the case settled amicably or by m[illegible]

of Arbitration or by receiving the [illegible]

value of those grounds and said that

he is willing to surrender [illegible] their

another
grounds to them the Pet[illegible] [illegible] com-

pensation of those [illegible] [illegible] that

if the said Streemwa[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

dissatisfied with this [illegible] [illegible] are refer[illegible]

by the Civil Court to [illegible] [illegible] their suit

8th [illegible] said Stree[illegible]

Afterwards [illegible] several

nivas [illegible] [illegible] add [illegible] [illegible] inment [illegible]

appeal petitions to the Board [illegible] their

they have [illegible] given [illegible]
authori[illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]ted petition
the Coun[illegible] Decision, informing them
the[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] rights to the grounds
in dis[illegible] of the proceedings held in
the Cu[illegible] [illegible] to the Government,
[illegible] another one to request
dispatch thereof to England. When, an
[illegible] passed by the Government
[illegible] the Petr &c to receive the value
of one of the [illegible] marked A which was
used by the Collr for road and to bring
a [illegible] Civil Court, regarding the
other grounds marked B C D E.

9th [illegible] the said Statements [illegible]
[illegible] received the value of only the
above [illegible] marked A at the rate which
was [illegible] Cutcherry of 10 Rs per
100 Feet [illegible] the other 4 grounds have
not been [illegible] by the above
Deeds.

10th [illegible] the value of the deeds of
[illegible]

sale executed by the said ...

Naik we selling the ground to the ...

as above stated, the Pltff has claims to

have these said grounds recovered and the tree standing

in the other sites belonging the land as above

mentioned are also in his (Plaintiff's) possession

As the value of the ground which was used

for the Public road, was paid to the above

Streeuwas Naik by the Cirkar; as the

other 4 grounds as above marked B, C, D, E, are

fraudulently kept by the Defts into their

enjoyment; as it is obvious from the

Collector paying the value of the said ground

marked A, that the Cirkar has no claims

to the grounds in question, and as they (the

grounds) are not now in the possession

of the Collector, he (the Pltff) did not in-

clude the Collr into the Defts that

this suit is brought only against

said Defts who at present enjoy the

grounds —

... [illegible] grounds are situated within the following boundaries—

The ground marked B is situated east of the Wezhing road leading to Vizhay river, south of the Annoppannady channel, west of the garden now in [the] Plff's possession & north of the road leading to the Tappacolam tank;

ground marked C is situated east of that marked B & south of the vacant spot in [his] (Plff's) enjoyment, west of the Ramalinga Muudaliar['s] [illegible] here [not] described (marked D) & north of the road leading to the Tappacolam tank;

ground marked D is situated east of that marked C, south of the vacant spot now in [his] (Plff's) possession, west of the ground hereinafter shewn (marked E) and [illegible] of the [said] garden belonging to Shoka-lingam Pillay and of Ramalinga Muudar

63/ ground marked E. & C. hav... ted

The western limit of this ground is not stated in Tamil	east of that marked D, ... the vaccant spot which the Pltff ... ; and North of the garden belonging to the said Shoictalingum Pillay

(signed) ... Tharby in Tamil

63

Translate of

a plaint preferred

by the Pltff

in the Said court

in Dec the 28 of

[illegible] 4 on the file

of the Said Court

[illegible]

7

[illegible]

[illegible]

No 134   Recd by the 10 ... 1854

Coddoocottah 1st Aug 1854

54

To The Secretary of the Board of Revenue
Fort St George

R

Sir,

I have the honor to refer for the decision of the Board the accompanying

+ 11th Augt 1854 copy of a letter from the Sub Collector putting 2 Questions

1st Whether Arrivals [illegible] Pollums are to be dealt with under Regulation [illegible] of 1822 or Regulation XXIX of 1802 or Regulation IX of 1822 and VI of 1831.

2d If under the latter, whether the same Rule is applicable to Arrivals [illegible] Mootahs

2. It appears to me that as it has been decided that Regulation XXV of 1802 [illegible] Pollums [illegible] not applicable to [illegible] Regulation XXIX of 1802 by parity of reason [illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible]

But as [illegible]

[illegible] for [illegible]

[illegible] them are not thereby entitled to

the privileges and exemptions conferred by

Regulation XIX of 1802

[illegible] Hadden — I have &c.

Sobroocottah

21st August [illegible]14

[illegible]

Collector

No. 155

55

To

Ma[illegible]a 16 September 1855

The Secretary to the Board of Revenue

Fort St. George

Sir,

R/

1 In reporting upon the accompanying Petition Board No. 18 of 1854. I have the honor to premise that the Petitioner and his adversary enjoy each a Yeomiah or ready money allowance of ½ Fanam per diem as well as the Conjoint Enaum of 2 Cheys Nunjah in the Village of Pullanganuttum which is the subject of the Petition

2 The Enaum was originally granted to Ghoolam ally Shah Fakeer or Durveesh during the rule of the Nabobs, and it

[illegible]

the name of the person
in the Hoozoor accounts of
Fusly 1212 (the Fysul year)
and 1217 when there was an
examination of Enams — So
Fusly 1229 the name was
changed in the Hoozoor
accounts to Yacoob Khan,
the father of Mahomed
Yacoob against whom
Petitioner complains, and
this name is continued
till Fusly 1262 when it
1852/53
was changed to Mahomed
Yacoob

2. It is an admitted
fact, that Golam Saheeree
had no sons but 4 or 5 daugh-
ters, of whom it is certain
2 had issue Viz-
Wuzeer Beebee and
Aishah

58

109

[illegible]bah Beebee to whom
the Nabob made the
additional grant of a yo-
-miah (ready money allow-
-ance) of 2 Rs. per diem, of
which in 1826 the Govern-
-ment continued ½ Tenam
in the name of Sail Khan
(the Petitioner) and ½ Tenam
in that of Mahomed Ya-
-cool who in Mr. Peter's
list ~~are~~ styled the sons
of Hoossein Beebee and
Aishah Beebee respective-
-ly, and are entered the
former as 25 years and
the latter as 30 years old.
The Mahomed Yacoob
of Mr. Peter's list therefore
could not be the Indivi-
-dual of that name now
alive

ality, who is not more
than 45 at the present
time, but was his father
Commonly called, as before
stated, Yacoob Khan
4 At the time of
Gholam Ally Sheik Father
-ree's death (which not-
-withstanding the entry of
his name in the Village
accounts so late as Fusly
1228 - ~~Lallabebee from~~ his
1818/19
daughter having obtained a
Yeomeah from the Nabob
had taken place during the
Mussulman Government)
Daul Khan was a child
and Yacoob Khan the eldest
male of the Family - The
latter therefore, naturally
took charge of the Enam

52

and it was entered in his name - He died, his son says, between the time of Mr. Peter's recommendation and the Government sanction (mentioned in Para 2) of the Yeomiah (read money allowance) in his name. Laul Khan then became the Senior [illegible], and [illegible] is admitted, managed the landed Enam giving Mahoomed Yacoob 1/2 the produce.

5 For some years, however, the landed Enam is allowed to have been in possession of Mahoomed Yacoob; but as regards the number of years and the mode in which it was transferred, the greatest discrepancy prevails in the statements of the parties - the discrepancy

discrepancy which I have
been unable to clear up
by means of Witnesses. The
Zemindars do not themselves
cultivate the lands; and
as they used to share
the produce equally, the
Ryots of the Village cannot
state positively who could
be considered to be in
possession.

6. Mahommed Yacoob
asserts that Lal Khan
is only the adopted son
of Boghy in Rubee and
that his real mother was
his (the zemindar's)
Father's Sister; and that
not being entitled to the
Land under the Mahommedan
Law, he gave it up to him
when he arrived at maturity. This assertion is
consequence

58/

113

consequence of the great age of Laul Khan is now incapable of proof, and being contradicted by the entry in Mr. Peter's in geomar Statement in 1824 alluded to above; where he is entered as the son; must I think be rejected.

7 Laul Khan on the other hand alleges that he had possession till 1845 when he went to a marriage and Petitioner usurped the Enam. If this were strictly true why did he omit to complain till 1851?

8 The truth of the matter I take to be this, that when Laul Khan was growing old, Mahomed Yacoob managed the land and would have

Continued

to do so without any com-
plaint. had he not taken
denied the right of Saul
Khan to ½ share on the
pretence of his being an
adopted son.

4 In equity I consider
them both entitled to share
equally, and if the division
of such lands were per-
mitted I would recom-
-mend that the dispute
should be so settled. If
this cannot be allowed,
I see no recourse but to
leave it, as at present, in
possession of Mahomed
Yacoob in whose Father's
name it was entered in
the accounts and who is
now in possession.

As regards the Zeemiah
the Board will find in
reference to Mr Peter's list

of the 20th December 1823
that the order of Government
dated 24th Augt. 1826 provi-
-ded that it should be con-
-tinued only during the
lives of the then subsist-
ing on it and afterwards
consequently
struck off the list. ~~The~~
as the Mahomed Yacoob named
in the list having died
before the sanction reached
Madura his share 1/2
Fanam per diem should
therefore have been at once
stopped. Instead of this Mr
Peter probably from inad-
-vertence continued it to
his son, then a child; and
in 1841 Mr Blackburne
granted this person a Certi-
-ficate under the Circular
Order of the Board dated
the 18th January 1841 (C.O.
Book Vol. 1 Page 294 -

The irregular continuance therefore would not have been discovered but for the dispute between the reci:
:pient and Lal Khaun about the landed Enam.
Under these circumstances I request instructions whether the Zeemeah of ½ per diem, enjoyed by Mohomed Yacoob, should be at once struck off, or whether in consideration of the peculiar circums:
:tance of his Fathers death in his childhood while the sanction was in transitu a tabular statement may be submitted for the orders of Government. I have issued a Putkeed for sus:
:pending payment pending orders.

60

The ½ Panam per diem sanctioned for Saib Khan by the order of Govt is now enjoyed by him-

do

62 No. 156 119

Madura 16 September 1817

To
The Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

Sir,
With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of the 3rd August last, I have the honor to observe, that owing to a clerical error in the first Para of my letter of the 4th July last, by which the word Yeomiah (which means daily allowance in money) is used at the commencement instead of Enam (grant in land) the meaning of my letter is rendered very obscure & has not been understood by the Board. I therefore take the liberty of requesting that that letter may be cancelled, and the or

accompanying enclosure/
which has been altered
in other respects to make
the subject which is in-
volved more clear/ may
be substituted.

LDP

No. 168 — Madras 29 Septr 1854

62

171 Rg

To
The Secy. to the Board of Reve.

Sir

With reference to the remarks of the Board of Reve. in their "Proceedings of the 26 July last relative to "Warrie" levied in the agraharam villages of Sittamundel &c. situated in the Ramnad Zemindary &c. I beg to express a strong opinion of the good policy of remitting this tax to all the Ryots including the Potta...

~~Thus~~ The tax is levied on Nunjah only in addition to the Melwaram of half the produce. As Govt villages in general are not similarly settled in kind. I cannot compare them with exactness: but ~~I can~~ ~~no doubt~~ that the remission of this tax will certainly not ~~do more~~ place Sittamundel &c in a more favourable condition than ~~all~~ the Govt villages in the Cuyar Talooks. Own those of some of the Talooks remaining with the Zemindar of Ramnad they will gain an advantage for as will be seen by reference to Para 29 of Mr Roberts' Report on the settlement of Ramnad under date 11 Oct. 1833 those are subject to the "Warrie" but the Govt and naturally with completely ~~the~~ Govt...

their Condition & Extent of Govt Lands and

& of a Boundary

No. 188 [illegible] 31 Octr 1854

To The Secy to the Bd of Reve

Sir

1. In reply to the Boards Proceedings of the 23rd Inst relative to Swamybhogum in Settavendal(?) I have the honor to state that the land in question, originally brought into cultivation by the Proprietor and Mirasidars called Pernoray(?), had, before the assumption of the villages by the Govt been made over to ~~Ryots~~ some Relations for cultivation on their own account, ~~inadequate~~ paid and these Ryots ~~paid to the~~ Melwaram and ~~paid a Swamybhogum~~ according at the rate common in the Zemindary viz 1/2 the net produce after deduction of common charges.

2. It is usual for Zemindars & others giving their private lands to others for cultivation to exact Swamybhogum in addition to Melwaram - This is done generally in Melwaram(?) - This is done [illegible] in the [illegible] State of Shevagunga(?), and in the [illegible] being Poodoo Collah(?) - the entire payment being a compensation for the orig. expenses of reclaiming the land - the Landlords Rent in fact as distinct from the tax to the Sovereign - Sevagunga Rachean(?) ~~did not otherwise the for~~ Guaranteed(?) it to the Ryots of these particular lands because they were his Relations: but on the assumption of the villages by Govt, the Sale(?) Amildar enforced it at the rate of 5 ~~Cullies~~ Mercals per Cullum of Seed land of Nunjah and 3 3/4 Mercals

per Cowle of Poorooshe on the ground that Poi
had succeeded to the "Meerassy" Rights of Coodigany
hatchers and had no per Motive for waiving those
Rights - Meerasadar Pasen can either take the revenue
Swamybhogum Meerus as a favour, or take value of the
the land into his own hands - The Swamy
bhogum Paddy ~~was~~ given in my letter was
Calculated at the Meerasdar's Rates of
the each Year
Root

No. 189. Madura 1st Nov. 1854

64

126

To

The Secy to the Board of Revenue

Rg

Sir

In reply to your letter of the 2nd Oct. 1854 I have the honor to state that the ~~instance~~ Kuns to which you refer relates only to Shevagunga— and that the table of measures were copied from the paper [illegible] enclosed in the letter from this Office dated 30th Oct. 1837— Hence the discrepancy in the proportions shewn between the English and Country Feet— I am unable to specify the Country or Shevagunga [illegible], for the Country Foot is not a fixed length. It would seem from Cases which have come before me [illegible] to be taken from the feet of men. [illegible] which are of exactly the same length. In Poodoocottah I find the proportion assumed of 12 Eng. Feet to be 14 ft. men's or Country. I should suggest that the Country feet sh'd be rejected altogether from the table.

2. As regards the ~~[illegible]~~ terms [illegible] I have only to state that the measure or Guz [illegible] locally be called the Sutteka [illegible] of 2 3/4 ft is [illegible] improperly so. The word though I sh'd think [illegible] Sutteka Kol is not used— If the Board are compiling tables I sh'd recommend

[illegible] use of the word Tutcha Koh, as it does
not seem desirable to give stability
to a corrupt application of the term
Mootlum - though here the Tutche or
Carpenters Mootlum is understood to be
distinct from the ordinary Mootlum or Cul[illegible]

[illegible]

No. 190 —

The Sub Secretary &c.

[illegible] of Arms

With reference to the concluding para of my letter dated the 26th [illegible] last I have the [illegible] to enclose the supple[illegible] [illegible] List of Candy[illegible] [illegible] & Tolies with [illegible] emoluments called [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] Arrears of

[illegible]

A 57

Malta

[illegible] Nov 1854

68

129

Supplemental List shewing the Cavilgars Taliaries and Totis with their Emoluments with reference to the letter from the Collector of Madura to the Board of Revenue dated 26th September 1854

No. of Talooks	Name of Talook	Cuttoopady Peons: No. of Cuttoopady Peons	Cuttoopady Peons: Amount of Teerwah on Enam lands allotted to the office Rs	as	p	Cavilgar or Taliar: No. of Cavilgars or Taliaries	Cavilgar or Taliar: Amount of Teerwah on Enam lands allotted to the office Rs	as	p	Totty or Mauthary: No. of Totty or Mauthary	Totty or Mauthary: Amount of Teerwah on Enam lands allotted to the office Rs	as	p	Tundelgars: No. of Tundelgars	Tundelgars: Amount of Teerwah on Enam lands allotted to the office Rs	as	p
1	Madacolum	"	"	"	"	128	2017	3	"	19[illegible]	1436	2	10	93	803	3	"
2	Teroomungalum	"	"	"	"	186	5715	5	10	246	2731	"	7	95	1308	1	10
3	Meylore	"	"	"	"	22	564	7	8	227	1990	11	11	153	1604	5	9
4	Taudicomboo	"	"	"	"	2	62	7	6	223	2462	10	10	101	1250	5	1
5	Iyempully	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	15	116	10	2	124	1296	1	10
6	Penkurray	"	"	"	"	8	87	4	10	11[illegible]	501	"	"	117	1230	8	1
7	Nellacottay	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	[illegible]	380	4	11	68	605	5	1
8	Ramglerry	"	"	"	"	44	650	2	11	15[illegible]	2143	9	6	88	1697	11	10
	Total	"	"	"	"	390	9697	1	9	120[illegible]	11762	2	9	839	9795	10	6
	4 per cent deducted from the settlement of hill villages	"	"	"	"	4	24	4	4	[illegible]	80	11	4	52	219	8	6
						394	9721	6	1	12[illegible]	11842	14	1	891	10015	3	4

Madura 3rd October 1854

E. E. pr.

[signature]

Collector

The Cavilgars are not equally distributed through the villages. In some there are none. In others several. In some there is no Enam. In others a large one.

The Totys & Tundelgars are primarily Revenue Officers but aid the Heads of villages in Police as well.

[illegible]

133

68

Tabular Report of [illegible] of Enams in the [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible]	Talook – Village Grant & value of the Enam	When & by whom granted – Name of the original Grantee Sunnud or other document in support of the Grant	Nature of the Grant [illegible] Charity or Service [illegible] nature of the [illegible]	Name of the last holder. Date of his decease & the relationship in wh he stood to the original Grantee	Share enjoyed by the deceased & that held by other members	Family left by the deceased – Name & age of the parties, their circumstances & the means of subsistence possessed by them.	Recommendation of the Collector & the grounds on which it is made	Recommendation of the Board of Revenue	Decision of Govt
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Claim to [illegible] [illegible]	Madavolam Talook Vilompetty Village Swarnamanium [illegible] Enam Cawnays to the extent of 2-6 Rs as ps taxed at 15 – 1 – 1	Granted during the Carnatic Govt Date & names not known In the accounts of Fusly 1212 the Manium is entered in the name of Eastwaranauthyor	Service Teaching Vedas to boys	Easwaranauthyor died on the 20 August 1850 the Enumdar in Fusly 1212 had no issue But by an order of the Sub Collector of the 2nd June 1831 the deceased was put in possession of the Enam in wh it is stated that "as the deceased Paramesurenauthyor (a mistake for Easwaranauthyor) has left no heir, you (the Tasr) are hereby directed to make over the Enam to Easwaranauthyor [illegible] who now continues to perform the duties"	The entire Enam was enjoyed by the deceased	Yrs Naraunauthyar son aged 17 Venkatachellauthyar 14 Meenatcheeammal daughter 30 Seetammal [illegible] 35 Coppammal sister 55 Parvathyammal brother's widow 30 Easwaranauthyar nephew 46 7 They possess [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ in the Village of [illegible] [illegible] rent of Rs 17 [illegible] 4	In the accounts of Fuslies 1212, 1225 & 17. the Enam is entd in the name of Easwaranauthyor who left no heir. By virtue of the order ~~[illegible]~~ in Col. 5 the deceased Easwaranauthyor enjoyed it ~~[illegible]~~ The lands are lying waste since certain years for want of repair [illegible] account which has now been done. There are no Bramins residing in the Village. It is therefore proposed that the Enam may be made over to Naraunauthyor the son of the deceased when his service will be required in the Village & the lands will come under cultivation [illegible] Tyenl [illegible] As the Tyenl Enamdars [illegible] that [illegible] as there are no Bramins [illegible] in [illegible] and Easwaranauthyor [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] lands in [illegible] this village. The Collr recommends that this Enam may be resumed as the Enam lands [illegible] lying waste. [illegible] [illegible]/54 C		

To the R. D. [illegible] Stone
Dated [illegible] 17[illegible]

Tabular Report of
lapse of Inam [illegible]
the Village of Vel[illegible]
pettah in Madr[illegible]

No 215 Madura
15th Decr 1854

The Secy to the Bd of Reve

I have the honor to enclose an application from C. K. Burgess Esq for a small piece of wood land on the Pulney Hills measuring 14 x 30 ft, adjoining that granted to him under the sanction of the Board dated the 17 June 1852 and to recommend that it may be complied with.

The land in question originally formed part of a wood, and under common circumstances, therefore, ~~I should~~ shall not be a party to any strict adherence to the Rules be made over ~~an application~~ ~~feel justified in supporting~~ ~~for it~~ but Mr Burgess built his house close to the wood before the Circular was circulated & could not without difficulty dispense ~~...~~ ~~promulgated~~, ~~& after~~ he afterwards cleared ~~he could not~~ this piece, which ~~he could not~~ ~~conveniently dispense with~~, under the impression that it was within his boundary.

Sd/

Tabular report on a lapsed Enam in the District of Madura

Case No.	Talook extent & Entire	Village & of the	When & by whom granted name of the original grantee Sunnud or other document in support of the grant	Nature of the grant charity or service, if service, nature of the duty reserved by the grant	Name of the last holder date of his decease & relationship in which he stood to the original grantee	Share enjoyed by the deceased & that held by other members	Family left by the deceased name & age of the parties their circumstances & the means of subsistence possessed by them	Recommendation of the Collector & the grounds on which it is made	Recommendation of the Board of Revenue	Decision of Govt.
1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Claim to succession to a yeomiah	Madura in Madacolum Talook ½ Cully fanam a P C equal to 1. 8. 37 per diem		Granted under a Purwanah (copy translation herewith sent) dated 5th Rubbee avol Hegeree 1175 or 5 Octr 1761 by Nawab Nowir Deen Khan to Hoossain beebee & Aishabeebee	Charity	Mohomed Yacoob alias Yacoob Khan son of the original grantee died in the year 1824	Entire	1 Zahoora beebee widow 70 years of age 2 Rajan Khan son 39 Do ~~alias Mahomed Yacoob~~ 3 Bulleynah beebee his wife 29 Do 4 Golam Hoossain Khan his 1st son 14 Do 5 Golam Moortuzah 2d son 6 Do 6 Yacoob Khan 3d Do 2½ Do 7 Ameenah beebee his daughter 10 Do Besides this Yeomiah he enjoys the cheys of Munjah land in the village of Pullunganuttom Madacolum Talook for himself & Laul Khan – vide Collr's letter to Board dated 16 Sept 1854 & ~~Board's [illegible] Sept 1854~~ Board's Procgs 6 Octr 1854.	This Yeomiah had been enjoyed for 31 Years or up to July 1854 by Mahomed Yacoob, when it was discontinued by the Collector as held without regular sanction. By the order of Government of the 24th Augt 1824 a Yeomiah of ½ F. per diem was granted in the name of Mahomed Yacoob commonly called Yacoob Khan who between the date of Mr Peter, the Collr's recommendation & the Govt sanction the Collector without a second application continued it to his son Raheem Khan commonly called Mahomed Yacoob then a boy, and the difference of the individual owing to the identity of name escaped observation till recently when the circumstances of the family came out on an Enquiry relative to a landed Enam. Although the grant in 182[illegible] was for life only; yet with reference to the peculiar circumstance of the Grantee having died before enjoyment & his son being immediately substituted by the then Collector & having held the Yeomiah from his childhood the Collector begs to recommend that it may be continued to him :— [illegible]		

Madura
22d Decr 1854

letter no. 2 [illegible]

To The Board of [illegible]
dated 22 Dec[illegible]

Re/.

Tabular report
on a lapsed [illegible]
in the District
of Madura.

Translation of a Purvanah granted by Nawab [illegible] Khan ~~[illegible]~~
Dated [illegible] of Hijra 1175 & 5 Oct. 1761.

~~Translation~~

Notice is given to the
that are now performing
the Circar duties and to
those that in future per-
form such duties in the
Sayer department of [illegible]
Madura pertaining to
Trichinopoly

That as it has been
resolved that [illegible]
Beebee and [illegible]
residing at the [illegible]
Beebee [illegible] to
from the Sayer [illegible]
two Madura [illegible] fully [illegible]
Daily

-ily for their subsistence

are to do so [illegible]

-ult [illegible] from the [illegible]

-tic Hannah. They

will pay for the per-

-manency of my [illegible]

-ity. [illegible]

5th A Appeal
heal in the
Supreme year
[illegible] 15-

[illegible]